

## **REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration.

Applicants' attorney wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephone conference of March 23, 2010. Applicants have rewritten the allowable subject matter in independent form that were indicated as being allowable in prior office actions.

Claims 1-8, 10-13, 15-23, 25, 26, 31-33 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Watts.

During the telephone conference with the Examiner, the Examiner indicated that Applicants should consider whether to amend claim 1, for example, to include receiving the location information and authenticating based on the information. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the claim for providing electronic message authentication in this example is authenticating a sender unit to a recipient, for example, and that the operations set forth in claim 1 are carried out, for example, by the sender unit as opposed to the recipient. As such, the amendments to the claims more clearly indicate that the data sent by the sender unit is data representing not only an electronic message but also both location information and the desired sender authentication information for the recipient.

Watts does not contemplate authenticating a message, for example, sent by a sender unit to a recipient using the Watts card or system. Instead, Watts attempts to authenticate the recipient to a computer system. Claim 1 requires, for example, that the information that is sent by the sender unit includes both location information, such as the column and row number for example sent to a recipient, as well as the desired sender authentication information for the recipient. The desired sender authentication information data that is sent to the recipient corresponds to the sender authentication information that is embodied on the article that has been

assigned to the recipient. The sender authentication information can be located on the article by using the location information and the sender unit also sends the data defined by that location information such as the information at a particular row and column. In one example, the recipient or user then looks at the article at the corresponding location using the received location information and sees if the sent desired sender authentication information from the sender unit matches the sender authentication information located on the article at the row and column address. If the match occurs, the recipient trusts the sender of the message. Watts does not teach such an operation and does not teach that a computer system sends the actual information located at the row and column along with the row and column information and a message. As claimed, the operation authenticates a sender of a message, as opposed to a receiver of a message to combat phishing or other sender authentication impersonation techniques. Since Watts does not teach the claimed subject matter, the claim is in condition for allowance.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Claim 15 is also taken from the perspective of the sender unit which, as opposed to the recipient, and includes similar limitations as noted in claim 1. Accordingly, this claim is also allowable at least for these reasons as well.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

As to claim 31, the claim is directed to an apparatus. Applicants respectfully reassert the relevant remarks made above with respect to claim 1. As such, this claim is also in condition for allowance.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Claims 29, 30 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Goede. There appears to be a typographical error in paragraph 33 of the office

action as it refers to the “Watts” reference. However, Applicants will treat this as a typographical error and assume that the rejection is based on the Goede reference. Claim 29 has been amended to indicate that the transaction card identification information is transaction card serial number information and identifies the transaction card. The office action cites Goede, col. 3, lns. 25-29 as allegedly teaching a transaction card that includes transaction card identification information in combination with sender authentication information identified by location information. However, the cited portion makes no reference to any type of transaction card identification information such as transaction card serial number information that is also embodied on a transaction card that includes sender authentication information identifiable by location information along with location information thereon. Since the Goede reference does not teach the claimed subject matter, Applicants respectfully submit that the claim is in condition for allowance.

Claim 36 has also been amended. As such, the same remarks apply. In addition, claim 36 requires also a translucent identification number also be affixed to the transaction card. Again, the references do not teach this combination. Accordingly, this claim is also in condition for allowance.

Claims 9 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Watts. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are allowable at least as depending from allowable base claims and also as adding additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 23, 2010

By: /Christopher J. Reckamp/  
Christopher J. Reckamp  
Reg. No. 34,414

Vedder Price P.C.  
222 North LaSalle Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60601  
PHONE: (312) 609-7599  
FAX: (312) 609-5005